Applicant: DeWolf et al.
Serial No. 09/740,568
Filed: December 18, 2000
Reply to Non-Final Office Action of March 7, 2007

recording information related to the asset, wherein the information is associated with a

unique identifier;

categorizing the information related to the asset into multiple attributes;

managing read and write privileges to the asset registry for a plurality of entities; and

providing access to asset information to entities that have an interest in the asset, wherein an

entity having write privileges for a first attribute of the asset can write data related to a

change in the first attribute of the asset to the asset registry, and an entity having read

privileges for a second attribute of the asset can read data related to the second attribute.

90. (previously presented) The method of claim 1 wherein said first entity writes data

pertaining to the first attribute and said second entity reads data pertaining to said second

attribute.

Remarks

Status

Claims 1-5, 7-9, 13-14, 17-19, 21-22, 24-25, 27-29, 31-33, 35, 37-38, 42-43, 46-48, 50-52,

13

Applicant: DeWolf et al.
Serial No. 09/740,568
Filed: December 18, 2000
Reply to Non-Final Office Action of March 7, 2007
54-61, 64-71, 74, 76-79, 81-86, and 88-90 are pending.   With this amendment, claim 71 has been amended.

The Examiner's rejection's are addressed and traversed below, and reconsideration is respectfully requested. With this amendment, including the remarks and discussion herein, Applicant believes the application is in condition for allowance and request timely notice of allowance.

Unexamined Claim

Dependent claim 90, added by way of the amendment-response of Nov 28, 2006 has not been acknowledged or examined by the office, and applicant requests such acknowledgment and review.

90.   *(new) The method of claim 1 wherein said first entity writes data pertaining to the first attribute and said second entity reads data pertaining to said second attribute.*

Notwithstanding that the applicant traverses the prior and current rejections of all the claims under 35 USC 101, and believes them to be improper as applied to all the claims and requests their withdrawal, claim 90 specifically recites that the entity accesses asset attributes. Examiner has indicated in both prior and the current correspondence, that such a limitation would meet the office's requirement for a tangible result. This is discussed further below, and while applicant does not concede that this limitation is necessary, as also discussed below, applicant believes claim 90 meets the statutory requirement as asserted by examiner and requests acknowledgement of such by the office.

Claim Rejections under 35 USC § 112

Applicant notes that claim 28, as previously amended in the prior amendment-response submitted Nov 28, 2006, reads:

14

Applicant: DeWolf et al.
Serial No. 09/740,568
Filed: December 18, 2000
Reply to Non-Final Office Action of March 7, 2007

28. The method of claim 1, wherein the ~~data~~ **_information_** recorded comprises data related

to one or more transactions pertaining to the asset.

Applicant submits that claims 28, 29, 31-33, 35, 37,38, 42 and 43 are definite and requests withdrawal of the 112 rejections.

Rejections Under 35 USC § 101

Claims 1-5, 7-9, 13-14, 17-19, 21-22, 24-25, 27-29, 31-33, 35, 37-38, 42-43, 46-48, 50-52, 54-61, 64-71, 74, 76-79, 81-86, and 87-89 have been rejected under 35 USC 101 as allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter, because it allegedly "does not produce a tangible result". The office alleges that no "real world result" is produced.

Applicant traverses the rejections and respectfully submits that the claims are statutory in that that the steps of: 1) providing access to the entities to the attributes and 2) managing the read and write privileges, and allocating read or write privileges to specific entities do accomplish a tangible and concrete result, i.e., that of assigning (or revoking) various access privileges to asset attributes to various entities, thus enabling certain entities to write attribute data into the registry and allowing other entities to only read attribute date within the registry. The specification teaches numerous ways in how such a method or system is useful, practical, concrete and tangible. Furthermore, the allocation of read and write privileges to the various interested entities so that they can write data or read data relating to asset attributes, thereby changing the asset record or accessing the attribute record based on their privilege allocation clearly accomplishes useful, concrete, and tangible results as detailed in the specification. For example, the status of the asset, including changes to the asset and its attributes, e.g., ownership, repair history, insurance status, value, etc. can be maintained throughout the life of an asset, via the granting to various interested parties access to the asset record attributes, for instance who can write data to the asset record thereby updating specific attributes of the asset (owner, repair organization, manufactures etc), or who can read data related to the asset (e.g., potential buyer, insurer, law enforcement, etc). And these read and write privileges can be re-allocated, revoked, etc, on an ongoing basis. The asset registry provides, inter alia, for a cumulative and up-to-date record of an asset to be maintained throughout the life of the asset and further provides that each interested party that has an interest in the asset has a means to access and update the asset

15

Applicant: DeWolf et al.
Serial No. 09/740,568
Filed: December 18, 2000
Reply to Non-Final Office Action of March 7, 2007

data as appropriate on an ongoing basis. These results are clearly concrete and tangible and such results flow inherently from the claim limitation, for example, the allocation of a write privilege to an entity changes the state of the asset record and provides the capability of the entity to write (change) the asset record, a capability that did not exist prior to the allocation of the privilege. Similarly, the allocation of a read privilege to an entity allows that entity to read asset attribute date, that the entity was unable to read prior to the allocation of the privilege, thus accomplished a tangible and real world result, e.g., enabling an entity to do what before it could not do (or conversely removing the ability to read or write from an entity that had such an ability prior to the privileges being allocated or re-allocated).

The office asserts that

> "managing read and write privileges to the asset registry... and providing access to asset attributes .. does not produce a real world result because the claimed invention merely provides capabilities to the entities...Nothing tangible happens until the entity ... reads or writes to the attributes... "

Applicant disagrees. Granting read or write permission to asset attributes to an entity that prior to such granting of permission, could not read or write to the asset attribute is a real world results. Similarly, revoking a read or write permission pertaining to an asset attribute from an entity is also a real world result.   The allocation of privileges by an entity, either granting or revoking read or write privileges to another entity, enabling or preventing the second entity from accessing asset attributes that prior to the allocation, said second entity was without or with such a privilege respectively, does result in a real world and tangible result.   For example, if an entity has an asset record pertaining to his/her automobile, and decides to allow a prospective purchaser to review specific attribute data of the auto asset record, the owner entity can allocate read privileges to the purchaser entity, giving the purchaser entity read privileges to the asset record, something s/he did not have before. Such a privilege can subsequently be revoked of course as well.   These are clearly real world results.

The most recent 101 rejection was purportedly based on the "Interim Guidelines on Subject Matter Eligibility" specifically requiring that the claimed invention produce a "tangible result". The present invention clearly produces a tangible result as stated above, i.e., the providing access and managing access privileges to asset information. Moreover, the claims under examination are not

16

Applicant: DeWolf et al.
Serial No. 09/740,568
Filed: December 18, 2000
Reply to Non-Final Office Action of March 7, 2007

one of the "judicial exceptions", but are members of the statutory classes, i.e., claim 1 is a process,

claim 2 is an apparatus (system) etc. The "Interim Guidelines" directs that the determination of

whether or not the invention produces a tangible result should be carried out only IF it is NOT one of

the four statutory classes and is one of the "judicial exceptions". This is not the case here.

Nevertheless, as the "Interim Guidelines" state with regard to the test for tangible result:

> "The third and final factor in this test for practical application is a determination of whether the claimed invention produces a tangible result. *The tangible requirement does not necessarily mean that a claim must either be tied to a particular machine or apparatus, or must operate to change articles or materials to a different state or thing. To be tangible the claim must recite more than a § 101 judicial exception, in that the process claim must set forth a practical application of that § 101 judicial exception to produce a real-world result.*"

...

> "If the result is merely a thought, this is not a tangible or real-world result. For example, merely determining or calculating a price may not be held to be a tangible result, instead reasonably being interpreted as just a thought or a computation within a processor; *however, calculating a price of an item to sell and then conveying the calculated price to a potential customer would be a tangible result.*"

As clear from the above guidelines, the tangible requirement does not mean that articles

themselves must be changed, but only that a real world result is produced. The invention as claimed

clearly produces a real-world result by allocating specific privileges to asset attributes and providing

the means for those attributes to be written to (changed) or read, or conversely preventing the reading

of or writing to attributes of asset (e.g., removing such read or write privileges from entities), and

further by providing for up-to-date electronically accessible attribute specific asset records for which

allocation of privileges can be assigned or revoked by and to various entities as desired.

Applicant does not concede that the Interim Guidelines referenced above constitute the state

of the law with respect to 35 USC 101, but references it because of its reliance by the Office in the

current rejection and in order to facilitate prosecution. Withdrawal of the rejections is requested.

Rejections for nonfunctional descriptive material

17

Applicant: DeWolf et al.
Serial No. 09/740,568
Filed: December 18, 2000
Reply to Non-Final Office Action of March 7, 2007

Claims 52-54, 71-74, 79, 81-84, and 86 have been rejected as being nonfunctional or nonfunctional descriptive material. Applicant traverses the rejections. The examiner apparently bases his additional rejections on the analysis of the preceding method claims (e.g., claim 1 etc), alleging that since no real world or tangible result is accomplished by the system, the system if not functional. Applicant disagrees and references the arguments above showing that the method and system accomplish a real world result. The system claim clearly recites elements, an asset registry and interfaces for managing privileges and providing access, that are clearly integrated when read in light of the specification; indeed, there would be no functional asset registry if these elements weren't connected, and the claims would be unintelligible if read with that interpretation. Examiner's statement that there is no functionality until a computer is connected is perplexing as this is inherent in both independent claims and in light of the specification. Examiner's also states that the wherein/whereby phrases are not given any patentable weight; applicant disagrees and does not understand as it is clear from the reading of the claim that the wherein limitations of operation and functionality pertaining to the allocation of privileges are required of the claim, that is, allocation of read and write privileges must occur. As referenced in MPEP 2111.04:

Claim scope is not limited by claim language that suggests or makes optional but does not require steps to be performed, or by claim language that does not limit a claim to a particular structure...

The determination of whether each of these clauses is a limitation in a claim depends on the specific facts of the case. In Hoffer v. Microsoft Corp., 405 F.3d 1326, 1329, 74 USPQ2d 1481, 1483 (Fed. Cir. 2005), the court held that when a "'whereby' clause states a condition that is material to patentability, it cannot be ignored in order to change the substance of the invention."

Withdrawal of the rejections is requested.

With regard to claims 71 and 74, the office states the *"because the electronic asset record generated from a process claim is not computer executable code, but a mere collection of data ... which even if recorded on a computer readable medium... remains nonfunctional."* Applicant disagrees. The electronic asset record produced by the recited method is not simply a mere collection of data, but rather includes specific computer or processor readable attributes, for example the allocated read and write privileges, which are utilized (e.g.,.., read, processed, executed) by a computer to accomplish a read world and tangible result, for example that of allowing an entity to

18

Applicant: DeWolf et al.
Serial No. 09/740,568
Filed: December 18, 2000
Reply to Non-Final Office Action of March 7, 2007
read or write specific asset record attributes. Furthermore, the data structures as claimed are not only generated by the system or method, but reside on computer readable media and thus define both structural and functional interrelationships between the data structures and the hardware and software, thereby enabling the functionality to be realized.

In re Lowry, 32 F.3d 1579, 32 USPQ2d 1031, 1035 (1994) the Federal Circuit affirmed that data structures of this type, when stored in processor readable format are statutory, stating:

> "More than a mere abstraction, the data structures are specific electrical or magnetic structural elements in a memory. . . . In short, Lowry's data structures are physical entities that provide increased efficiency in computer operation. They are not analogous to printed matter. The Board is not at liberty to ignore such limitations."

The electronic asset record is not a nonfunctional data structure, but rather physical entities which provide specific functionality to computer operation Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 USC § 103

Claims 1-5, 7-9, 13-14, 17-19, 21-22, 24-25, 27-29, 31-33, 35, 37-38, 42-43, 46-48, 50-52, 54-61, 64-71, 74, 76-79, 81-86, and 88-89 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as obvious in view of Abraham et al. Applicant traverses the rejections. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in light of the remarks below. Moreover, initial consideration of claim 90 submitted in the previous amendment, but not considered in the current action, is requested.

The office has still made no prima facie showing of obviousness. In fact, the art cited here, US 5,446,903 to Abraham, was originally cited to reject claims of the current application under 35 USC 103 in the office action of Feb 4, 2005. Applicant's response resulted in the 103 rejections being withdrawn by the office in the action of Aug 24, 2005; applicant hereby incorporates the comments of that response herein. Applicant recognizes that a different rationale for the rejection has been stated by the office and addresses it below. Nevertheless, applicant submits that the new grounds for rejection are without merit, and respectfully requests their withdrawal. Also, in the current rejection, it does not appear that the office has considered the most recent amendments and further has not considered the invention or claims as a whole.

19

Applicant: DeWolf et al.
Serial No. 09/740,568
Filed: December 18, 2000
Reply to Non-Final Office Action of March 7, 2007

Abraham discloses a method for controlling access to data elements in a data processing system based on the status of an industrial process by mapping user's security categories and industrial process steps. Abraham is concerned with methods for controlling data security in a data processing system that controls an industrial process, the methods for controlling security involving assigning access rights or privileges to parties involved in the industrial production process at various points during the production process depending on the respective parties' relative involvement or required input in the production process. The primary need for such a system is to protect the security and prevent corruption of any of the vast number of data elements within the system. Because it may be the case that a great number of individuals within the organization are each involved in some way and at some point in the production process, it is important to restrict each person's access to only those data elements within the production system that each person is authorized to modify. The invention of Abraham provides a method for assigning specific access rights, to individuals (or groups of individual) involved in an industrial production process, to specific data elements (or categories of data elements) within a data processing system that controls the production process. The invention of Abraham is an improvement over various "engineering control management" and "revision control systems" that were well known at the time of the invention of Abraham. A primary purpose of each of these systems was to insure that the production process moved forward with consistency and accuracy by preventing the corruption of data, by maintaining access control, and restricting access to authorized parties.

Applicant respectfully points out that the invention disclosed by Abraham is very different from the present invention of the Applicant as claimed in claims 1, 52, and 55 and the claims dependent therefrom. Applicant's invention is concerned with, inter alia, methods, systems, and apparatus for the electronic registration of assets in general, examples of assets including real estate, automobiles, consumer good and electronic appliances, weapons, artwork, patents and copyrights, and generally anything that can be owned, and for which ownership rights can be transferred. The asset registry of the present invention provides for an electronic asset record for each registered asset, the asset record comprising pertinent information about the asset such as information pertaining to ownership, value, history of the asset, component makeup, warranty, insurance and legal information, current status, etc. Said asset record, maintained in an asset registry, being capable of being electronically accessed by various interested parties that may have an interest in the asset, such parties including the producer of the asset, the owner of the asset, a prospective buyer of the asset,

20

Applicant: DeWolf et al.
Serial No. 09/740,568
Filed: December 18, 2000
Reply to Non-Final Office Action of March 7, 2007

and insurer or warrantor of the asset, a financer of the asset, a servicer of the asset a government or regulatory body concerned with the asset, etc. The asset registry allows for the maintenance of an up-to-date record of each relevant attribute of each asset and for access control to one or more of those attributes by a party of interest, and would provide for the capability for conducting transactions that alter the state of ownership and other attributes of the asset. Applicant's invention, moreover, provides significant and distinct advantages, as detailed in the specification and discussed further below, not taught or disclosed by the prior art.

The Examiner states that "*Abraham teaches a method for recording information related to assets throughout a cycle of the asset ... (independent projects, inherently each project is identified with a unique identifier)*". Examiner appears to have equated Abraham's concept of a project, in the context of the engineering control system, with that of Applicant asset concept. Applicant disagrees. The objective of Abraham's invention is to improve t control over of an industrial processes, whereas Applicant's invention is directed to the management of assets. What Applicant's means by "asset", as discussed above, and what Abraham means by "project" are very different. Respectfully, Examiner has improperly attempted to stretch the meaning of Abraham "project", which is limited to a compilation of data elements for a data processing system that controls an industrial process, to encompass Applicant's invention which is concerned with assets generally (e.g., assets which can be owned and for which ownership can be transferred). Examiner further attempts to stretch the meaning of Abraham by improperly equating the access control purpose of Abraham with that of the Applicant. The interested entities in Abraham are those concerned and affiliated with the creation and modification of data elements within a data processing project, i.e., the individuals or department that have various production roles in the development of the project. This is in contrast and significantly different than Applicant's invention where interested entities include those with an ownership, financial, or other interest in an asset and such interests extend beyond the mere production of the asset, e.g., the owner, insurer, financier of an automobile have interest that may extend through the life of the automobile. Abraham is concerned with data elements in an industrial control process and not to the ownership of the assets, as in the Applicant's invention. Further to the independent claims is that of providing various levels of read and write access to the asset registry and asset records and attributes of assets contained therein to these different entities depending on the entities interest or stake in the asset, e.g., degree of ownership or other financial

21

interest of the asset, liability for asset, legal regulation of the asset, appraisal of the asset in anticipation of purchase or ownership change of the asset, etc.

Applicant's invention as claimed is not obvious in view of Abraham. Although the invention of the Applicant comprises elements of granting and controlling access and read/write privileges to various interested entities, this is neither the sole primary feature of the invention (as it is in Abraham), nor is such granting and controlling access in the same context as that of Abraham. Abraham is concerned with security and access control of a particular data processing system within a particular organization and for a specific production process whereas Applicant's invention is concerned with the registration of assets generally, within and without specific organizations and including the lifecycle subsequent to production. Moreover, the asset concept, as in the present invention is absent from that of Abraham. Applicant's invention addresses, inter alia, the registration of any and all classes of assets by the creation of an asset record and provides for the capability of all interested parties to have specific access rights to the asset record and to access, update or otherwise modify authorized information over the Internet or other electronic network. This is very different as contrasted with the invention with Abraham which is concerned only with controlling access rights to data elements of a specific data processing system directed toward the control of a single industrial process within a single organization. Thus, while Abraham is concerned primarily with the problem of controlling access to data elements of a project within an organization, Applicant's invention is directed to the registration of assets generally and the manipulation of the registered assets' records. Furthermore, Abraham does not speak to ownership of the asset, which is a feature of the Applicant's invention.

Examiner appears to be improperly presuming that Applicant's innovative technique of registering assets and providing levels of access to interested parties is already known and the use of access control such as in Abraham is thus an obvious modification, which is not the case. Additionally, there is nothing in the referenced art that would suggest asset registration in general as in the Applicant's invention.

Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner reasoning is improper and relies on hindsight. As stated by the Federal Circuit:

Defining the problem in terms of its solution reveals improper hindsight in the selection of the prior art relevant to obviousness ... By defining the inventors problem in terms of the its

22

Applicant: DeWolf et al.
Serial No. 09/740,568
Filed: December 18, 2000
Reply to Non-Final Office Action of March 7, 2007

> *solution, the district court missed the necessary antecedent question, namely, whether the*
>
> *prior art contains suggestion or motivation...Monarch Knitting Mach Corp v Sulzer Morat*
>
> *GmbH, 139 F.3d 877, 45 USPQ 2d 1977*

Further, it appears that the Examiner is suggesting that the present invention is rendered obvious because a component of the invention, that is the security and access control utilized by the invention, has analogous properties to engineering control management principles, even though the application is clearly different than that of engineering control management and provides numerous features and benefits which have nothing in common with the referenced prior art.

As stated by the Federal Circuit, In re Fritch , 972 F.2d, 1260, 23 USPQ 2d 1780, 1784 (1992)

> *"It is impermissible to use the claimed invention as an instruction manual or 'template' to*
>
> *piece together the teachings of the prior art so that the claimed invention is rendered*
>
> *obvious.... One cannot use hindsight reconstruction to pick and choose among isolated*
>
> *disclosures in the prior art to deprecate the claimed inventions"*

Furthermore, obviousness cannot be predicated on whether one of ordinary skill in the art would have the capabilities to arrive at the invention. In Ex parte Levengood, 28 USPQ 2d 1300 (Bd. Pat App. & Inter 1993), the Board stated:

> *At best, the Examiner's comments regarding obviousness amount to an assertion that one of*
>
> *ordinary skill in the relevant art would have been able to arrive at the appellant's inventions*
>
> *because he had the necessary skills to carry out the request process. This is an inappropriate*
>
> *standard for obviousness.. That which is within the capabilities of one skilled in the art is not*
>
> *synonymous with obviousness*

With regard to the claims limitation "for the entire lifecycle of the asset", Examiner refers to Abraham stating *"the asset (project) ...progresses through a series of step, etc. which implies life cycle of a project"*. Applicant respectfully points out that Examiner has misconstrued the Applicant's concept of lifecycle vis-à-vis that of Abraham. In Abraham, each project may have a development cycle in which data elements are modified until the project is completed, but this is completely

23

Applicant: DeWolf et al.
Serial No. 09/740,568
Filed: December 18, 2000
Reply to Non-Final Office Action of March 7, 2007

different than that asset lifecycle of the Applicant's invention, which includes information, status

changes, and interested entities of the asset before, during, and after production, sale, etc. of the asset.

Furthermore, the created asset record can become part of the asset itself and can be transferred with

the asset (e.g., sold with the asset) as distinct from Abraham where the project record remains within

the organization.

Regarding claims 52-54, although Abraham discloses that users affiliated with the project

may be distributed and thus connected by some sort of network, this fact is not relevant because, as

has been discussed, Applicant's invention is very different from that of Abraham, and directed to the

registration of assets generally, with numerous advantages not found in Abraham or in the prior art.

The fact that Abraham's "user" may utilize a network to access a project ongoing within the user

organization makes Abraham no more relevant than systems which utilize a network with which to

transfer data between distributed computers.

With regard to claim 54, Examiner take Official Notice that "*providing information*

concerning asset management over the Internet is old and well known in the art" and that "*it would*

have been obvious ... to incorporate the system of Abraham such that users may access the asset

registry over the Internet". Applicant respectfully challenges Examiner's assertion above regarding

providing information concerning asset management over the Internet, and requests that Examiner

substantiate his assertion by providing evidence, e.g., by citing specific prior art. Applicant concedes

that transmitting information over the Internet is old and well known, but submits that providing

information concerning asset management, as contemplated by the present invention, was not known

or taught by the prior art at the time of Applicant's invention, nor was there as suggestion to do so.

The rejections of system claims 55-61 are traversed and should be withdrawn. The

discussions above are applied and directly relevant to claims 55-61, which are not obvious in view of

the prior art for the points and reasons already discussed.

Applicant's invention provides numerous advantages not disclosed, taught, or contemplated

by the prior art. Applicant's invention provides methods and systems whereby many different

organizations having varying interests in the same asset can share or access information concerning

that asset, and by which transactions and status changes concerning assets can easily be recorded and

appropriate interested parties notified electronically, thus greatly increasing efficiency and

24

Applicant: DeWolf et al.
Serial No. 09/740,568
Filed: December 18, 2000
Reply to Non-Final Office Action of March 7, 2007

accurateness, while potentially reducing costs. For example, Applicant's invention provides an efficient method for asset information management such that asset data and records are maintained and are not "lost", e.g., after a transfer of ownership, and such that the "history" of the asset can be chronicled and maintained in a single comprehensive record. The asset registry and asset records provide a single and comprehensive source for attributing ownership of an asset or property to as well as maintaining an up-to-date status regarding relevant attributes providing for all types of interested parties to participate in the registry, including owners, producers, sellers, financiers, insurers, law enforcement agencies, courts of law, legislative and regulatory agencies bodies. The system greatly enhances accuracy, efficiency and ease of use, by linking all the asset pertinent information together in a single record, obviating the need to refer to multiple unconnected and disparate records. The asset registry provides a great benefit to asset owners who would have an accurate and complete historical record of their assets including an audit-able trail of asset transactions and status changes, as well as the ability to share such information with whomever they chose, e.g., including prospective purchasers, insurers, law enforcement, etc. Furthermore, the invention provides a single strategy that allows for the record of ownership and history of assets to be developed, transferred and accessible in a standardized format using a standardized approach which would greatly facilitate the integration of disparate and unconnected records across multiple data sources. These and other benefits of a asset registry comprising accurate and comprehensive asset records that are readily electronically accessible via a network by multiple parties and to which varying degrees of access can be granted are not taught or suggested by the prior art. Notwithstanding the aforementioned advantages, examiner has failed to make out a prima facie case of obviousness.

With regard to the additional rejections of claims 52-61, 71-74, and 81-84, the same arguments as made by the applicant regarding this same rejection under 35 USC 101 are applicable here. The rejections should be withdrawn.

Additional ground of Rejection – Nonfunctional material

The discussion above applies as well to the rejection based on non-functional descriptive material. The office acknowledges that Abraham does not teach the assigning, recording, categorizing, managing, and providing access to assets attributes in an asset registry, but then goes on

25

Applicant: DeWolf et al.
Serial No. 09/740,568
Filed: December 18, 2000
Reply to Non-Final Office Action of March 7, 2007

to allege that these differences are *"only found in nonfunctional descriptive material"* and further that *"there is no manipulative difference in the process involved based upon where the information is recorded"* and …*"the examiner need not give patentable weight… absent any non-obvious functional relationship between the descriptive material and substrate"*, and therefore *"it would have been obvious… to apply the process steps of Abraham to any type of nonfunctional data because such data does not functionally relate to the steps in the method claimed and because the subjective interpretation of the data does not patently distinguish the invention"*.

Firstly, as admitted by the examiner, the office has not even come close to showing each and every element of the claimed invention as required in making an obviousness rejection; that is elementary, the prior art must show each and every element of the claimed invention. Failing to do this, the office alleges that the elements for which it cannot show in the prior art are non-functional descriptive material and as such should not be afforded any patentable weight. Respectfully, this view and ground for rejection is untenable.

The detailed discussion given already above clearly explains how the material is functional and is directly related to the invention as a whole, and how Abraham is only tangentially similar to the current invention in that is uses a common means of internal and project related software access control. Abraham does not teach or suggest the breadth of applicant's invention, and could not, as apparently implied by the examiner, be used to accomplish applicant's invention simply by changing some data, as discussed above.   See In re Gulack, 703 F.2d 1381, 217 USPQ 401, 403 (Fed. Cir. 1983)

> Differences between an invention and the prior art cited against it cannot be ignored merely because those differences reside in the content of the printed matter. Under section 103, the board cannot dissect a claim, excise the printed matter from it, and declare the remaining portion of the mutilated claim to be unpatentable. The claim must be read as a whole.

Although the data and data structures of applicant's invention are not "printed matter" or analogous thereto, in that they are functionally interrelated to the method and system as described above, examiner's contrary view notwithstanding, even if they were the rationale for the rejection cannot be sustained.   Respectfully, all rejections have been overcome and should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

26

Applicant: DeWolf et al.
Serial No. 09/740,568
Filed: December 18, 2000
Reply to Non-Final Office Action of March 7, 2007

For all the reasons discussed above, Applicant believes that all rejections have been overcome and submits that the application is in condition for allowance and requests a timely Notice of Allowance be issued.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that issue or comment. Because the arguments made may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or others) that have not been expressed. Furthermore, the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Respectfully submitted,

/Gregory Flickinger/
Gregory Flickinger
Reg. No. 45,271
Telephone: 706-291-6071

27